

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated December 22, 2008 (the “Office Action”). Claims 1-7, 9-22, 24-35 and 37 are pending. Claims 1 and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 24-34 are Allowable

The Office rejected claims 24-34 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As claimed, the computer program product comprises “a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon an electronic form...” Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is directed to a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon the electronic form, not simply the electronic form. Hence, claims 24-34 are directed to statutory subject matter and are allowable.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-22, 24-27, 29-33 and 35 are Allowable

The Office rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-22, 24-27, 29-33 and 35, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over BountyQuest Website (“BountyQuest”) in view of European Patent No. EP 1,160,708 (“Utsumi”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays “one or more currently identified infringement targets and accepts an infringement submission including first user input to identify an additional infringement target” (emphasis added), as in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, BountyQuest discloses displaying “bounties”, finding a document with required information, and collecting the “bounty”. *BountyQuest*, Main Page, p. 3. As noted in the Office Action, “BQ [BountyQuest] does not explicitly disclose that the source and the sources information deal specifically with infringement claims.” See the Office Action, page 3-4. Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays “one or more currently identified infringement targets and accepts an infringement submission including first user input to identify an additional infringement target” (emphasis added), as in claim 1.

In further contrast to claim 1, Utsumi discloses a charging system that solicits information from third parties about products that supposedly infringe on a right holder's lawful right. *Utsumi*, Abstract. The cited portions of Utsumi disclose a form that accepts user input regarding a product that supposedly infringes the right holder's lawful right. See Utsumi, FIG. 3. The cited portions of Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest displaying one or more currently identified infringement targets. Therefore, the cited portions of Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays "one or more currently identified infringement targets and accepts an infringement submission including first user input to identify an additional infringement target" (emphasis added), as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-22 and 35 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

The cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 24. For example, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form "to display one or more currently identified infringement targets and to accept first user input to identify an additional infringement target" (emphasis added), as in claim 24.

In contrast to claim 24, BountyQuest discloses displaying "bounties", finding a document with required information, and collecting the "bounty". *BountyQuest*, Main Page, p. 3. As noted in the Office Action, "BQ [BountyQuest] does not explicitly disclose that the source and the sources information deal specifically with infringement claims." See the Office Action, page 3-4. Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form "to display one or more currently identified infringement targets and to accept first user input to identify an additional infringement target" (emphasis added), as in claim 24.

In further contrast to claim 24, Utsumi discloses a charging system that solicits information from third parties about products that supposedly infringe on a right holder's lawful right. *Utsumi*, Abstract. The cited portions of Utsumi disclose a form that accepts user input regarding a product that supposedly infringes the right holder's lawful right. See Utsumi, FIG. 3. The cited portions of Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest displaying one or more currently identified infringement targets. Therefore, the cited portions of Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest

an electronic form “to display one or more currently identified infringement targets and to accept first user input to identify an additional infringement target” (emphasis added), as in claim 24.

Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 24. Hence, claim 24 is allowable. Claims 25-27 and 29-33 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 24.

Claims 5 and 28 are Allowable

The Office rejected claims 5 and 28, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over BountyQuest, in view of Utsumi and further in view of “Glossary of Intellectual Property Terms”, published in 2001 (“Bramson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. The cited portions of Bramson fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi. For example, the cited portions of Bramson fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays one or more currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Bramson describes definitions of intellectual property terms. *Bramson*, Title. The cited portions of Bramson fail to define ‘infringement target’ and fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form. Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest, Utsumi and Bramson fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. Hence, claim 5 is allowable.

Claim 28 depends from claim 24. As explained above, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 24. The cited portions of Bramson fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 24 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi. For example, the cited portions of Bramson fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. In contrast to claim 24, Bramson describes definitions of intellectual property terms. *Bramson*, Title. The cited portions of Bramson fail to define ‘infringement target’ and fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form. Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest, Utsumi and Bramson fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 24, from which claim 28 depends. Hence, claim 28 is allowable.

Claims 34 and 37 are Allowable

The Office rejected claims 34 and 37, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over BountyQuest, in view of Utsumi and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,243,519 (“Andrews”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 34 depends from claim 24. As explained above, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 24. The cited portions of Andrews fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 24 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi. For example, the cited portions of Andrews fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. In contrast to claim 24, Andrews describes translating text fields within an interactive software application from a first language to a second language. *Andrews*, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Andrews fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form to display currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 24. Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest, Utsumi and Andrews fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 24, from which claim 34 depends. Hence, claim 34 is allowable.

Claim 37 depends from claim 1. As explained above, the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. The cited portions of Andrews fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of BountyQuest and Utsumi. For example, the cited portions of Andrews fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Andrews describes translating text fields within an interactive software application from a first language to a second language. *Andrews*, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Andrews fail to disclose or suggest an electronic form that displays currently identified infringement targets, as in claim 1. Therefore, the cited portions of BountyQuest, Utsumi and Andrews fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1, from which claim 37 depends. Hence, claim 37 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the cited references applied in the Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

3-20-2009
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)